

**CITY OF BIRMINGHAM  
PLANNING BOARD ACTION ITEMS  
OF WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2016**

Item	Page
<b>UNFINISHED BUSINESS</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>1. 555 S. Old Woodward Ave. (555 Building)</b>  <b>Request to amend Zoning Ordinance to render existing buildings legal, conforming structures and to permit additions and renovations</b></p>	
<p><b>Motion by Mr. Share</b>  <b>Seconded by Mr. Koseck to set a public hearing on December 14, 2016 for the proposed D-5 Ordinance, section 3.04 (4) with changes to the existing language in (a) adding <u>number of stories</u> between setbacks and height. Secondly, revising section (c) to include enlargements in the areas above the D-5 height limit, subject to Planning Board approval and a SLUP. Section 6.02 will remain as presented.</b></p>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>Motion carried, 7-0.</b></p>	<b>4</b>
<b>FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEWS</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>1. 401-451 S. Eton (Irongate)</b>  <b>Request for Revised Final Site Plan Review to consider as built site plan and design changes from previous approval</b></p>	
<p><b>Motion by Mr. Share</b>  <b>Seconded by Ms. Whipple-Boyce that the Planning Board approve the Revised Final Site Plan for 401-451 S. Eton (Irongate) subject to administrative approval of three items:</b>  <b>1) Submission of a photometric plan and staff's determination that it meets the ordinance;</b>  <b>2) Screening of the AC units in the back;</b>  <b>3) The placement of a sufficient number of trees to meet the ordinance or obtaining a variance.</b></p>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>Motion carried, 6-0.</b></p>	<b>6</b>
<b>PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEWS</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>1. 2010 Cole (currently under construction)</b>  <b>Request for Preliminary Site Plan Review for three-story addition to existing building</b></p>	
<p><b>Motion by Ms Whipple-Boyce</b>  <b>Seconded by Mr. Share to postpone the Preliminary Site Plan Review for</b></p>	<b>7</b>

Item	Page
<b>2010 Cole to December 14, 2016.</b>	
<b>Motion carried, 7-0.</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>APPLICATIONS FOR REZONING AND ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1. 412-420 E. Frank St.</b> <b>Frank Street Bakery and Petrella Designs</b> <b>Request for rezoning of the property from R-3 (Single-Family Residential), B-1 (Neighborhood Business), and B-2B (General Business) to TZ-1 (Transition Zone)</b>	
<b>Motion by Ms. Whipple-Boyce</b> <b>Seconded by Mr. Koseck to table the applications for rezoning for 412-420 E. Frank and resume them at the November 9, 2016 Planning Board meeting.</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Motion carried, 7-0.</b>	<b>9</b>

APPROVED

---

**CITY OF BIRMINGHAM  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2016  
City Commission Room  
151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan**

---

Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on October 26, 2016. Chairman Scott Clein convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

**Present:** Chairman Scott Clein; Board Members Robin Boyle, Stuart Jeffares, Bert Koseck, Gillian Lazar, Janelle Whipple-Boyce; Alternate Board Member Daniel Share; Student Representative Colin Cousimano (left at 9 p.m.)

**Absent:** Board Member Bryan Williams; Alternate Board Member Lisa Prasad

**Administration:** Lauren Chapman, Asst. Planner  
Jana Ecker, Planning Director  
Carole Salutes, Recording Secretary

**10-177-16**

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 28, 2016**

Mr. Share made the following change:  
Page 5 - First full paragraph, first sentence, replace "than" with "then."

**Motion by Mr. Share  
Seconded by Mr. Koseck to approve the Minutes of September 28, 2016 as amended.**

**Motion carried, 5-0.**

VOICE VOTE  
Yeas: Share, Koseck, Boyle, Clein, Jeffares  
Nays: None  
Abstain: Lazar, Whipple-Boyce  
Absent: Williams

**10-178-16**

**CHAIRPERSON'S COMMENTS** (none)

**10-179-16**

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

There has been a request for postponement of the Preliminary Site Plan Review for 2010 Cole.

**10-180-16**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**1. 555 S. Old Woodward Ave. (555 Building)**

**Request to amend Zoning Ordinance to render existing buildings legal, conforming structures and to permit additions and renovations**

Ms. Ecker offered background. In order to renovate and expand the existing building, the owners of the 555 S. Old Woodward building have requested a Zoning Ordinance amendment to create a new D-5: Downtown Gateway Over Five Stories zoning classification in the Downtown Birmingham Overlay District. The proposal was to seek rezoning of the 555 S. Old Woodward properties from the existing D-4 Overlay zoning classification to the proposed D-5 Overlay zoning classification, which would essentially render the existing buildings at 555 S. Old Woodward as legal, conforming structures and would allow for an addition at the south end that could go up to a height equal to the height of the building that exists now on the southern (residential) portion.

On September 28, 2016, the Planning Board discussed draft ordinance language that proposed to create a D-5 Zone District that would render existing buildings legal and conforming with regards to setback and height. Board members agreed that additions or renovations should be permitted to existing buildings. The consensus of the board was to allow additional height for new buildings in the D-5 to match existing adjacent buildings if the new building was constructed under the provisions of a Special Land Use Permit ("SLUP"). Presently the non-conformity section of the ordinance allows for non-conforming residential buildings to be altered, but it does not allow for non-conforming commercial buildings to be altered. So the proposal is to simply say that non-conforming buildings could be expanded in accordance with the regulations.

Ms. Ecker advised she did forward the Planning Board's request for review to the City Attorney. The City Attorney has advised that the question of whether the Planning Board can waive specific requirements is not a legal question, but rather a policy question. Ultimately, the City Commission has the sole authorization to pass zoning legislation, with or without waivers, so long as they remain in compliance with the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act.

Mr. Share thought the ordinance should say that a height difference as well as other differences above five stories are allowed subject to a SLUP. As it reads now you can go higher, but not wider for example on stories six, seven, or eight, SLUP or not.

Ms. Ecker went on to say the applicant has submitted revised ordinance language with changes with regards to a request to potentially adjust the maximum height of a new building being placed on the site to exceed the height of existing adjacent buildings in the same zone district.

Mr. Richard Rattner, Attorney, 380 N. Old Woodward Ave., presented a PowerPoint. He said the draft ordinance proposed by the City allows the property owner to build up to the same height as an existing, abutting building in the D-5 Zone. However, they suggest that if the height remains the same it would be unfair because they could not reach the same number of stories. Modern buildings allow more room between the floors. Also, antenna and other

appliances at the top could not be hidden. Therefore, they would like to have the opportunity to go 10% higher.

Ms. Ecker observed that an extra 10 ft. in addition to the building height is allowed to screen mechanical and associated equipment.

Mr. Koseck cautioned that the board should be careful not to look at a design rendering and form an opinion based on that design. Ms. Whipple-Boyce agreed. She can't imagine going to 110% when there is the ability to appeal to the Board of Zoning Appeals ("BZA"). Further, an extra 10 ft. in height is allowed to cover mechanical.

Ms. Ecker advised that Mr. Johnson suggested in the draft ordinance, section 3.04 subsection 4 (a) buildings are deemed legal, conforming with regards to setbacks, number of stories and height. Another possibility he suggested is that instead of creating a D-5 Zone, move the proposed language into Article 6, the nonconformity section, and say it would apply to all buildings in the Overlay. Board members expressed their opinion that doing so would open up the potential for a number of unintended consequences. Board members did not support this.

Chairman Clein asked for comments from members of the public at 8:05 p.m.

Mr. Marshall Fry, a property owner in Birmingham, asked what a D-5 Zone is and Ms. Ecker explained it is a new Downtown Overlay, five stories or more, that is being considered for application to one or more properties within the Downtown.

Mr. Rattner clarified they are not asking for more stories; they are asking for the same number of stories. Mr. Koseck noted that no one has ever talked about making a taller building than the 555; this was only about bringing it into conformance.

Ms. Ecker said in the past they have discussed a rezoning of three properties, the 555 Buildings; Birmingham Place, 411 S. Old Woodward Ave.; and/or the Merrillwood Building, 225 E. Merrillwood, to the proposed D-5 Zone (over 5 stories). In response to the chairman, she said the owners of these properties have not contacted her about being included.

Mr. Jerry Reinhart indicated he is an owner of 411 S. Old Woodward Ave. as well as the 555 Building. He thought that to apply the law uniformly across all of the non-conforming uses makes a lot of sense. It should be a policy issue, not a developer specific issue.

Board members indicated they have not studied the other properties with regard to setback, number of stories and height like they have the 555 Building. There was disagreement as to whether the board can move forward without the other owners being contacted. Ms. Ecker then stated she would contact them directly. Chairman Clein said he would be comfortable moving forward to a public hearing if the owners are notified.

#### **Motion by Mr. Share**

**Seconded by Mr. Koseck to set a public hearing on December 14, 2016 for the proposed D-5 Ordinance, section 3.04 (4) with changes to the existing language in (a) adding number of stories between setbacks and height. Secondly, revising section (c) to include enlargements in the areas above the D-5 height limit, subject to Planning Board approval and a SLUP. Section 6.02 will remain as presented.**

There was no public discussion at 8:20 p.m.

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

VOICE VOTE

Yeas: Share, Koseck, Boyle, Clein, Jeffares, Lazar, Whipple-Boyce

Nays: None

Absent: Williams

**10-181-16**

**FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEWS**

**1. 401-451 S. Eton (Irongate)**

**Request for Revised Final Site Plan Review to consider as built site plan and design changes from previous approval**

Chairman Clein announced that his company has a business interest with one of the applicants and he will recuse himself on this matter. Ms. Lazar took over the chair.

Ms. Chapman advised the Irongate Building is a recently completed building located on the east side of S. Eton south of Villa. The subject development received Revised Final Site Plan approval on July 25, 2012 as an addition to the Crosswinds Development. Upon a final inspection conducted by Planning Staff on August 23, 2016, numerous discrepancies were cited on all sides of the building in relation to the approved plans, which resulted in receipt of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy, and the posting of a substantial bond. While many of these issues are considered minor in nature and may be eligible for Administrative Approval, the number and extent of the changes exceeded administrative approval authority and thus require Planning Board review.

The applicant is seeking approval for changes to the approved Final Site Plan and Design which was approved by the Planning Board on July 25, 2012. Specifically, the applicant is proposing to keep the previously approved footprint for the building with various changes to the design on all elevations and the rear of the site adjacent to the driveways. The landscaped islands where the HVAC units are currently installed do not match the approved plans, and further do not properly screen the HVAC units. Additionally, the required number of trees for this development has not been provided.

Ms. Ecker identified that the biggest issues for her are the unscreened mechanical units and the islands in the rear that are visible from the buildings to the east.

Mr. Share was troubled by the moral aspect **hazard** of receiving approval for changes that have already been made. At what point does the development community take away from this that it doesn't matter if they don't pay attention to the details because they can come in after the fact and everything will be taken care of.

Mr. Jake **Bolyard** Belliard, Belliard-Bolyard Lumber Co., said he is partners with the Mocerri family in the project. He indicated that he is embarrassed by the shortness of the islands. The curbs were staked wrong and they are 3 ft. shorter than the neighbor's to the east. Further, he is concerned that by putting more trees in the front it would take away from that beautiful building. Therefore, they would love to leave it the way it is.

Mr. Share commented it puts this board and the administration in a pretty uncomfortable spot because they are not able to say it is okay for developers to ignore the site plan and do whatever they think is right at the spur of the moment. Mr. Koseck noted that with the changes the quality is there.

Mr. Boyle stated that installation of 18 additional light fixtures is a significant change to the lighting of this building. It is not something that was done by accident. It was done because the architect and the builder thought it would improve the building. Mr. ~~Bellard~~ **Bolyard** replied they tried to do the best they could but there is no doubt there are a few things they missed. Mr. Boyle said they didn't miss it, they added it and it is a considerable change from the plan. It is troubling that they are asking the Planning Board to accept it after the fact.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce thanked the developer for such a beautiful building. However, someone should have come in and talked to staff about all of these changes before they happened. Now the board feels stuck in a position where they are setting possibly a very bad precedent for future projects, builders and architects by saying draw it one way, build it another, and ask forgiveness.

Mr. Dominic Mocerri said he came for the original site plan approval. He gave great credit to his nephew, Dominic F. Mocerri, who is the project manager and did an exceptional job on his very first project. Chairperson Lazar told him no one is denying they have built a beautiful building. The problem is their total disregard for policy that sets a very bad precedent.

Mr. Koseck noted that if he thought in any way it made a lesser building he would say change it. Being in the business, he can see how these things happen.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce thought that because there are so many more lights than were approved it might make sense to have a photometric plan done to see just how much more the building is illuminated. Do an administrative approval for that. Ms. Ecker said there is a requirement for a certain number of trees and screening of the rear mechanical units. The applicant will have to comply or get a variance.

The chairperson took discussion to the public at 8:55 p.m.

Mr. Jim Schmeier, President of the Board of Eton St. Station, the adjoining condominiums to the subject property, said this project has increased their values in the last few months probably about \$40 thousand to \$60 thousand/unit. It is a beautiful entrance to their community and maintains the spirit of their community. The fact that the islands are shorter is to everybody's benefit. In terms of the exposed A/C units it looks no different than what they have. Maintaining landscaping on those islands is difficult at best. They have had to re-landscape ten years down the road because too many plants were mandated at first and now they have become overgrown and died from overcrowding. He thought the developers ought to be congratulated rather than hung out to dry.

Mr. Jeffares observed that the same procedure and policy has to be applied to everyone even though these changes have been improvements and not a reduction of value.

**Motion by Mr. Share**

**Seconded by Ms. Whipple-Boyce that the Planning Board approve the Revised Final Site Plan for 401-451 S. Eton (Irongate) subject to administrative approval of three items:**

- 1) **Submission of a photometric plan and staff's determination that it meets the ordinance;**
- 2) **Screening of the A/C units in the back;**
- 3) **The placement of a sufficient number of trees to meet the ordinance or obtaining a variance.**

No one from the public had any comments about the motion at 8:50 p.m.

**Motion carried, 6-0.**

VOICE VOTE

Yeas: Share, Whipple-Boyce, Jeffares, Boyle, Koseck, Lazar

Recused: Clein

Nays: None

Absent: Williams

Mr. Dominic Mocerri apologized to the Planning Board that he was out of order.

**10-182-16**

#### **PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEWS**

##### **1. 2010 Cole (currently under construction)**

**Request for Preliminary Site Plan Review for three-story addition to existing building**

Request by applicant to postpone.

**Motion by Ms Whipple-Boyce**

**Seconded by Mr. Share to postpone the Preliminary Site Plan Review for 2010 Cole to December 14, 2016.**

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

VOICE VOTE

Yeas: Whipple-Boyce, Share, Boyle, Clein, Jeffares, Koseck, Share

Nays: None

Absent: Williams

**10-183-16**

#### **APPLICATIONS FOR REZONING AND ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS**

##### **1. 412-420 E. Frank St.**

**Frank Street Bakery and Petrella Designs**

**Request for rezoning of the property from R-3 (Single-Family Residential), B-1 (Neighborhood Business), and B-2B (General Business) to TZ-1 (Transition Zone)**

Ms. Ecker noted the subject property is located on the southeast corner of Frank St. and Ann St., and includes one corner lot (Lot 32, Blakeslee Addition), one lot immediately to the east facing Frank St. (Lot 31, Blakeslee Addition), and the rear 32 ft. of lots 3 and 4 of the Blakeslee Addition that front on S. Old Woodward Ave.



The applicant is requesting that the Planning Board hold a public hearing to consider the rezoning of the western portion of the property (412 E. Frank Street, parcel #19-36-253-001) from R-3 (Single-Family Residential) to TZ-1 (Transition Zone), and the central portion of the property (420 E. Frank Street, parcel #19-36-253-002) from B-1 Neighborhood Business to TZ-1 (Transition Zone) and the eastern portion of the property (no known address, parcel #19-36-253-003) from B2-B to TZ-1 (Transition Zone).

All three of these lots or portions of lots were previously combined and appear to have been split into three independent parcels prior to 1960. The three parcels are currently under common ownership. Ms. Ecker went on to summarize the history of the zoning on each of the three lots. The question now is whether the parcels should go from Single-Family, Commercial, Commercial to all TZ-1 Residential. In response to Mr. Jeffares, Ms. Ecker said if all three lots were combined under TZ-1, it would be possible build to up to 5 units with a total of ten parking spaces required.

Mr. Alex Bogarts, architect for the petitioner, described the mixture of uses in the area and why this property is suitable for consideration by the board for TZ-1 zoning. They see it as a great value to the community. There is ample space to meet or exceed any parking requirements.

Chairman Clein called for comments from members of the public at 9:40 p.m.

Mr. Eric Morganroth, 631 Ann St., said his R-3 residential neighbor should stay residential. He doesn't want to be the first residential home on this property when the corner lot should establish residential. He has no issue with the other two parcels being rezoned to TZ-1.

Mr. Eric Wolfe, 393 E. Frank St., said the corner parcel signifies the entrance to the single-family neighborhood. The original intention was to restore and preserve Single-Family Residential. He doesn't see any justification for the rezoning at all. It is totally developer driven and an encroachment into a single-family neighborhood. This area is congested and under tremendous parking pressure already. Further, he has no doubt this will have a negative effect on property values and he urged the board to deny the request.

Ms. Rohini St. Provon, who lives on Ann St., stated this is a sensitive residential area that is very congested. Another multi-family structure would create parking issues if they had guests and the overflow goes onto Ann St. Therefore, she opposed any multi-family property in that area.

Ms. Sariki Doshi, 659 Ann St., said she currently lives next to a multi-use apartment building. She also opposes the rezoning for all of the reasons that have been stated.

Mr. Sal Bitonti, 709 Ann St., owner of the property being discussed, said there is ample parking for the five units he hopes to build. They will be beautiful condos. He noted that Ann St. is predominantly condos and it has very little traffic.

Mr. Marshall Frye, said he owns the corner of Ann St. and Frank St., 610, 612 Ann St. and 380 Frank St. It is a home containing three apartments. He agrees with Mr. Wolfe that the neighborhood should remain as it is, a lovely community of residential homes.

Mr. Paul Reagan said one of the goals of the Central Birmingham Residents Assoc. has been to reclaim Ann St. from the mistakes that have been made for 50 years. To hear there is yet

another home being planned for the corner is heartwarming. There is no reason to rezone the existing single-family home to TZ-1.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce said she has heard a very compelling argument to leave R-3 as it is. In her mind the other two parcels probably need some attention, but she doesn't know if TZ-1 is exactly the right thing to do.

Mr. Koseck wondered if the applicant has investigated whether the R-3 parcel could remain and the center parcel and the ones to the east could change to TZ-1. Mr. Bogarts replied they have not explored that opportunity and they are before the board for TZ-1.

Mr. Boyle noted it is clear that those who have already invested in the neighborhood wish to see single-family homes in the area. Mr. Koseck said they all agree this is a transitional zone. He thought if it were developed properly it could be this charming little thing at the end of the street.

Mr. Jeffares didn't see where five units would create more traffic than a restaurant. He doesn't see street values suffering. A single-family home could max out the lot; whereas if it is multi-family it would come back to the Planning Board and they could make sure it is something that fits.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce thought it would be most appropriate to leave the R-3 house on the corner as it is. She was willing to entertain a different zoning classification for the other two parcels.

Mr. Share wondered if the massing of the building isn't better for the neighborhood with a multiple-family development. The board should be cognizant of the fact that just preserving R-3 in that one corner isn't necessarily going to be an improvement when someone builds to the max.

Chairman Clein said he has yet to hear any proof this evening about why the R-3 parcel is transitional. Therefore, he cannot support the request to rezone to TZ-1.

Mr. Bogarts indicated they would like to be tabled in order to evaluate the R-3 site on the corner to see how much of a footprint is available for them to build and how practical that is.

**Motion by Ms. Whipple-Boyce**

**Seconded by Mr. Koseck to table the applications for rezoning for 412-420 E. Frank and resume them at the November 9, 2016 Planning Board meeting.**

Mr. Eric Wolf made it clear that he does not support the motion.

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

ROLLCALL VOTE

Yeas: Whipple-Boyce, Koseck, Boyle, Clein, Jeffares, Lazar, Share

Nays: None

Absent: Williams

**10-184-16**

**2. 2100 E. Maple Rd.**

**Whole Foods  
Request to amend Zoning Ordinance and/or Zoning Map to clarify the  
boundaries of the Rail District to include this site in the Rail District, and to  
allow bistro uses on parcels within the Rail District.**

Ms. Ecker recalled that on September 30, 2015 the Planning Board approved the Final Site Plan for the Whole Foods Market, which is currently under construction at 2100 E. Maple Rd. As a part of the development plan the owners of Whole Foods Market are interested in pursuing a bistro license in order to establish a full service restaurant serving alcohol inside of the new store. To that end, the owners of Whole Foods submitted the required five (5) page Bistro concept summary by October 1st of this year in order to be considered for one of the two available licenses in 2017.

On October 10, 2016, the City Commission selected the Whole Foods Bistro concept to be considered by the Planning Board for a Special Land Use Permit ("SLUP") that would permit the issuance of a liquor license for this purpose. It is understood that bistros are permitted in the Rail District; however, the Whole Foods property is zoned B-2 (General Business) and does not currently permit bistros as a use.

Accordingly, the developers of the Whole Foods have submitted a request for an amendment to clarify the boundaries of the Rail District to include the Whole Foods site and to permit bistros throughout the District. Currently, the MX (Mixed Use) Zoning District allows bistros in what is commonly referred to as the "Rail District." Although there are several references to the Rail District throughout City documents, there are no specifically defined boundaries for the Rail District.

As a response to the request of the applicant, the Planning Division has drafted ordinance language and amendments that would create a map defining the Rail District boundaries, as well as ordinance language to permit bistros within the boundaries of the Rail District.

The Jet's Plaza could be included in the Rail District for the purpose of streetscape standards but still not allow bistros there.

Mr. Boyle asked if there is a reason to discuss how to extend the location of the Economic Development License to extend not just on Woodward Ave. but along Maple Rd. as well. Ms. Ecker responded that could be done.

Ms. Kelly Allen, Adkison, Need, Allen, & Rentrop, Attorney for Whole Foods, said that Whole Foods will meet the criteria for an Economic Development License, but they have no desire to put anything other than a small bistro type restaurant in their establishment. She does think it makes some sense to change the Economic Development Map that is attached to the Zoning Ordinance as opposed to changing the Zoning Ordinance throughout to define the Rail District. But the bottom line is whether it is an Economic Development License or a Bistro License the use will be the same and in her view would qualify either way.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce expressed her opinion that the Economic Development License is more appropriate. Mr. Boyle thought this large market being built is a big piece of Economic Development and it makes sense that it has within it the appropriate license that goes with it instead of forcing a cozy, small scale bistro.

Ms. Allen reminded everyone that the stakes are really high to get an Economic Development License and for the most part properties up and down Maple Rd. other than Whole Foods will not be able to meet that requirement.

Ms. Ecker thought they should define the boundary for the Rail District. It makes sense then to look at the properties that abut the railroad tracks. It will be a harder sell to come all the way off Woodward Ave. to allow Economic Development Licenses.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce saw this more as an Economic Development License because it doesn't seem to fit the development of a bistro.

Chairman Clein wondered if the policy of an Economic Development License should be re-visited by the City Commission to not be restricted to any geographic location and subject to their approval.

**Motion by Ms. Lazar**

**Seconded by Mr. Jeffares to extend the meeting for 10 minutes to 11:15 p.m.**

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

Board members were in agreement that they have to define the boundaries of the Rail District and figure out which properties to include.

Ms. Allen advised that Whole Foods will open in 2017 and clearly they would like to put in a bistro. Also she sees all the wisdom in the world for an Economic Development license in this case.

Chairman Clein said for the next meeting he is hearing that what he has been prepared so far on the rail approach on definition of the boundaries is a good, solid first step. Also there is discussion to be had about the ordinance language related to where Economic Development Licenses are allowed and how that might be applied elsewhere.

**10-185-16**

**MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA (none)**

**10-186-16**

### **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

a. Communications

b. Administrative Approval Correspondence

- 180 Brown St.
- 401 S. Old Woodward Ave. - AT & T proposes to replace three (3) existing antennas with three (3) new and add three (3) RRUS (small radios) to the existing configuration.
- 912 Old Woodward Ave., C.W.C. - Moving/relocating placement of Wine Cellar condensing unit on rooftop.

c. Draft Agenda for the Regular Planning Board Meeting on November 9, 2016

- 412 to 420 E. Frank continued discussion;
- 33353 Woodward Ave., Tuffy Building, Preliminary Site Plan Review for a new building;
- Birmingham Theater, License to serve alcohol;
- Woodland Villa gate;
- Dormers discussion.

d. Other Business (none)

**10-187-16**

**PLANNING DIVISION ACTION ITEMS**

- a. Staff report on previous requests (none)
- b. Additional items from tonight's meeting (none)

**10-188-16**

**ADJOURNMENT**

No further business being evident, the chairman adjourned the meeting at 11:07 p.m.

Jana Ecker  
Planning Director